P.F 25 of 95

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1893-94

~~192~~ .

(2 . R.)

File No. 87 of 93

Serial Nos. 1—14

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—14

Major ~~Part~~ B for November 95

SUBJECT. ~~Regarding~~ Dispute Shanbhag of Mouthšima Honakote Taluk,

---

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Index

Petition No. 287 of 93-94

Petitioner.

I

Krishnappa

of Kennur

Bangalore Taluk

represented by

Mr B. Srinivasaiengar

Application for reconsideration of the order of Govt. of 26th January 94, regarding the Shanbhogi of Mudanda, Hoskote Taluk.

The above document is dated 5/8 It was sent to the Tahsildar on 6th but was received in our office on 9th. Hence the delay in submission.

Submitted.

28/7/95

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893. 2 (2)

No. 1018

Name of Petitioner. Ramaiah Shanbhogue of Huttanahalli

Village. Huttanahalli

Taluk. Hoskote

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 6-10-93

Date of Receipt. 10-10-93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. three

ABSTRACT.

States that the Shanbhog Nanjappa was dismissed as he had altered the record with the police in ascertaining the theft case, that the Deputy Commissioner then ordered that the Shanbhogue office must be registered in the name of the widow of the dismissed man who lives with him & that during the lifetime of the dismissed man connected with the dismissal Agamidara should be appointed to look after the duties, & that by

the above order the guilty man
had no legal punishment at
all for the office is with his 3
undivided brother Krishnappa.

Says that His ~~punishm~~
office may be registered in his
name as his half-brother if
it so he is not at all connected
with the guilty person or if that
could be done he or his brother any
may be appointed as guardian the said
to that office.

13/11

Pet 707

16-11-93

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

4

(3)

L.R. 87-93-2

The accompanying Petition No. 1018 dated 6th Oct. 93 received at the Dewan's Office from Ramaiya of Muksandra, Assistant Collector appealing against the Bangalore Deputy Commissioner's C. A. S. 33, Executive Order dt. 8, Transcript of Proceedings

is forwarded, together with its two enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District for submission of proceedings with a report on the facts of the case and on the points raised in the petition.

2. The petitioner should be informed accordingly.

By Order,

13/11

Chief Secretary.

Draft

BANGALORE, 12 Nov 1893.

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—21-11-92—3,000.

(General Serial No. 30.)

189 . 10890

From The Dy. Commissioner Bangalore District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 10th January 1894

Despatched 12th January 1894

Received 13th January 1894

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No.

No. 775

In reply to his official memo No. Pet 7/7 dated 13-11-93.

SUBJECT.

Reports on petition from Ramiah Muntsandra Hos-Kote Taluk claiming the office of Shanbhog of that village.

L.R. 87-93-3

Pet March 15/94

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Let the Council for which this reference is made [illegible] return as noted at page 3 of this letter.

The Petr. Ramiah will have to be requested to appear in person to register the office in his name and in this appeal he will have the following alternate reliefs (1) that the office be registered in the name of one of the petitioners who are considered as interested in the disputed matter of (2) that in case the Govt. consider that the petitioner (an undivided brother of the dismissed man) is the nearest heir of the person deceased or that the Petr may be appointed to discharge the duties of the office during the life of the dismissed man

Recd. has ordered the appointment of Petr as Sumarta if he is found fit, & no more can be done for him.

26/1/94

11 Recd 1/2

D. No. 775
1 file

6

By Commissioner's Office.
Bangalore District.
Dated 10th January 1894.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore

Sir,

In reference to your Official Memo No Pol 707 of the 13th December 1893, calling for a report on the petition of Ramiah of Mantsandra, Hoskote Taluk, claiming the office of Shanbogue of that village, I have the honor to report that Cunjappa who was dismissed the Shanbogue of the village hushed up a case of theft and was therefore dismissed. In ordering this dismissal I requested the 2nd General Assistant in charge of the Taluk to appoint a successor who was unconnected with the family. The Assistant Commissioner accepting

with the file of memoranda papers.

9 the dismissed Shanbogue and Ramiah's
appeal under report is not so
much to contend the above
principle as to secure the Gumashta
-ship to himself. I am going to
send the following order to the
2nd General Assistant now as re-
-gards "Ramiah." If the Government
thinks that it satisfies the re-
-quirements of the case Ramiah
may be so informed. The order is
"Ramiah states that he is divided
and lives separately from the dismissed
Shanbogue - The object to be secured
by the appointment of a man
unconnected with the family
is that the dismissal should
operate in effect, that is the dis-
-missed man should lose his
official income and also his
official influence. If Ramiah's
appointment as Gumashta secures
this double Bject and if he is

fit for the Office he may be so appointed"

The enclosures of your Official Memo are returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

H. Kuman Rao

For Dy Commissioner

WHK

the Millers nomination in favor of one Krishnappa, connected with the family recommended his appointment on the ground that office is hereditary. By order thereon was certainly not. The office may be registered in the name of the next heir to the dismissed man, but a totally unconnected man should be appointed by Government as Sunnabta during the life time of the dismissed man. The only information contained in the Assistant Commissioners letter about Ramiah was Krishnappa and Ramiah are related in one way or other to the dismissed Shanbogue. I have no information as to how my order has been carried out. I think the permanent successor to the office should be the next legal heir of


GOVT. BRANCH OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
RECD. No. 1018
DATE 10-10-93





A.S.No 55
93-94.

12

Mysore Dewan's Office,

No. 1018 / A.S. 55-

L.R. 87-93-4

13-2-94

Petition Department,

8 February 1894

13

(7)

Endorsement granted to Ramaiya of Hatsandra

Hosakot-Taluk, Bangalore District,

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 1018 / A.S. 55- dated 6th October 1893 praying that the Shanbhogi of Hatsandra be rejoined in his name, or that if it be rejoined in the name of the deceased Shanbhogi's eldest son, Government be pleased to grant him a pension during the life-time of the deceased man.

Petitioner is informed that the Deputy Commissioner has reported that he has ordered the appointment of Peons as granted if he is found fit. No more can be done for him.

2. The enclosures are returned herewith.

8/2/94

"By Order"

Draft-

(Countersigned)

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-94—2000.

Copy

Rec: 13417 Pet 1293 9 Jan 13 1894

Copy forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District, with the records received with his No 77 dated 10th January 1894.

By Order

Chief Secretary

S.V. 1/2

(General Serial No. 32.)

1894. (5)

No. 1153

Name of Petitioner. Nirchatappa, son of Shanbhog Gorlinkatty Gutt

Village. Honnur

Taluk. Bangalore

District. do

Date of Arzi. 25-12-93

Date of Receipt. 3-1-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. two

L.R. 07-93

ABSTRACT.

States that his deceased father Subbiah was the hereditary Shanbhog of that village till his death & after that the office devolved on his eldest son Ranjappa; that the latter held the office for a long time & was finally dismissed for aiding a police defaulter in gambling operations; that thereupon he (petr) who was the second brother of the said Ranjappa, applied to be appointed Shanbhog in his stead & after due enquiry & approval by the Amildar & the Sub-Assistant Officer he was appointed as the sole remaining heir of the Shanbhog; that the deputy commissioner merely ordered that (petr) should be entered

ffice in the Register's Chamber, &c
ected that some strangers totally unconnected
ith the dismissed Chamberlain, should be appointed
r the place during the lifetime of the said Jaffa
at the said order of the Deputy Commissioner
based upon a supposition that the petitioner
as an uncle's brother having a joint
terest with the dismissed Chamberlain
affa; that there is a malapert fellow
e inhabitants of Thrissur named to the effect
at he (petr) has been living quite apart
f Menon for the last 30 years & that he
s a fit person to be their Chamberlain in lieu
the dismissed man; that the Deputy Commissioner's
asons for excluding him (petr) from office
re not sound as the dismissed Chamberlain
affa has not been for any such offence
s would entail a complete forfeiture of his
editary right, & as none of the recited
uch grounds, he (petr) is not excluded thereby
om holding the office; & that he (petr)
ould not prefer this appeal earlier as he
as not furnished with the copy of the
Deputy Commissioner's final order until
he 20th inst, & endorsed thereon, although
e, respectfully applies for the same.

15

Duffedar, in hushing up a crime.

3. That thereupon the Petitioner Hiro Innappah, who is a devided younger brother of the said Runjappah, applied to be appointed Shanbogue in his stead and after due enquiry and approval both by the Amildar and Sub Devision officer, Petitioner was recommended as the sole remaining huckdar for the Shanboguship.

4. That the Deputy Commissioner merely ordered the Petitioner's name to be entered up in the Register as Huckdar Shanbogue, but directed that some stranger totally unconnected with the dismissed Shanbogue, should be appointed for the place during the life time of the said Runjappah.

5. That the said order of the Deputy Commissioner is based upon a supposition, that the Petitioner is an undivided brother having a joint interest with the dismissed Shanbogue Runjappah.

6

16



(4)



Court Fee Stamp

Presented by the Counsel for Petitioner

5/1/94

In the court of His Excellency the Dewan of Mysore.

Bangalore

Revenue Appeal No: of 1893-94.

Petitioner:-

Krishtappa son of Ranatha Sobbiah residing in Hennoor Sprasimanhapoor Hobly - Ranpaire Taluq:-

The Petitioner above named begs to state as follows:-

1. That Petitioner's deceased father Sobbiah was the hereditary Shanbogue of Mottalumba, till his death and after that the office declined on his eldest Son Ranjappah.

2. That the Father held the office for a long time and has lately dispised for aiding a Police

Duffedar

No. 1653

L.R. 67 93-1

20-2-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

17th February, 1894

Endorsement granted to Krishnappa song Shanbhog Subbaiya Kennur Bangalore Taluk (by Mr B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Advocate)

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 1653 dated 26-12-93 appealing against the Bangalore Deputy Commrs order regarding the Shanbhogi of Mutsandra

Petitioner is informed that Government decline to interfere with the order of the Deputy Commissioner which is just and proper.

The enclosures are returned.

"By Order"

Chief Secretary.

Draft

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-95/2000.

6. That there is a Rakagne from the inhabitants of Mottadinda to the effect that the Petitioner has been living quite apart at Kemmes for the last 5 or 6 years and that he is a fit person to be their Shanbogue in lieu of the dismissed man.

7. That the Deputy Commissioner's reasons for excluding Petitioner from office are not sound.

8th. the dismissal of his brother Ranjappah has not been for any such offence as would entail a complete forfeiture of his hereditary right.

9th. even if there exists such grounds the Petitioner is not excluded thereby from holding the office.

9. That the Petitioner could not prefer this appeal earlier as he was not furnished with the copy of the Deputy Commissioner's final order until the 20th instant, as endorsed thereon - although the Petitioner repeatedly applied for the same.

Bangalore
25/12/93.

C. Krishnaswamy
Advocate for Petitioner

(General Serial No. 32.)

1894.

No. 2687

Name of Petitioner. Krishtappa, son of Thalla Gubbiah, ryot & Thandavanayaka, adult

Village. Hennoor

Taluk. Bangalore

District. Do

Date of Arri. 11-3-94 Bangalore arrival

Date of Receipt. 13-3-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. two

L.R. 87-93

ABSTRACT.

Prays that his case may be reviewed & re-considered for the following among other reasons:-

1) The dismissal of petitioner's brother from office was not for any offence connected with his office as a Thandavanayaka the offence consisted merely of writing out a Report for Police Duffedar, it cannot reasonably entail any forfeiture of hereditary rights of the family - vide - para 7 of the late Chief Commissioner's General Circular no: 5 of 1872-73

(2)

(General Serial No. 32.)

1894.

No. ~~2687~~ 2941

Name of Petitioner. Krishtappa. son of Thambiah Doobiah

Village. Hennoor

Taluk. Bangalore

District. Do

Date of Arzi. 30-3-94

Date of Receipt. 3-4-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. two

L. R87-93-8

ABSTRACT.

With reference to this office endorsement no: 2687, dated 27th March 1894, the petitioner states that he has affixed two Rupees stamp to his previous petition no: 1653, dated 25th December 1893 & has sent the Power of Attorney too with the same petition & this is only a reminder.

5/4.

As Mr. Digumbur is absent on tour & other business requires his attention, I have returned the petition no: 1653 & the Power of Attorney by hand as reported in letter no: 775 & 776 dated 20th April 1894, & also to the petitioner on verbal application. This is only a reminder.

Ltr 28/4/94

Application for review of order passed on Petn 1653-
In time-
Stamp insufficient-
Petr's advocate contends that stamp affixed (one anna) sufficient, because the original (No 1653) was presented on requisite stamp (two Rupees) & the Court Fees Act ordains that appln for review should be on Rupee stamp.
The grounds for review are as in para 6 of the Petn
Submitted for orders.

Hon Member Chelgod may pass order on question of stamp

Ltr 14/5/94

The petition should be on Rupee stamp. Petr called upon to make good the deficiency in stamp & attend the office this day (28th April 1894) for the purpose.

28/4/94

Petr attended & stamp made good.

28/4/94

Ltr 28/4/94

Ltr 14/5/94

The petition should be on Rupee stamp. Petr called upon to make good the deficiency in stamp & attend the office this day (28th April 1894) for the purpose.

28/4/94

Petr attended & stamp made good.

28/4/94

(2) The Govt Rules No. 527-54-17 of
9th May 1891 - rules that when a
village Thumbay is dismissed 21
for the offence, it is not proper
except in extreme cases that the
family should be altogether deprived
of their right to the office by the
unqualified appointment of a
stranger.

(3) The petitioner being an adopted
brother living long since altogether
seperately in a seperate village
& being duly qualified for the work
of a Thumbay as has been certified
to by the Inamdars of the villages
& as ~~still~~ petitioner has still his
old mother living with him
who is the Registrar of the
Thumbay might see question proper
that justice may be done by
conferring the Thumbay on him.

19/3

as the sole remaining Shuckdar for the Shanbogue Ship vacant.

IV That the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore District merely ordered the Petitioner's name to be entered up in the Register as Shuckdar Shanbogue but directed that some stranger totally unconnected with the deceased Shanbogue should be appointed for the post during the life time of the said Ramjappah.

V Petitioner appealed against the said order but your Excellency rejected the appeal without a hearing.

VI Petitioner therefore most humbly prays that his case may be reviewed and re-considered for the following among other reasons:—

(1) The dismissal of Petitioner's brother from office was not for any offence connected with his office as a Shanbogue and as the offence consisted merely of writing out a Report for Police Duffedar it cannot reasonably entail any forfeiture of the hereditary rights of the family - vide - Para 7 of the Late Chief Commissioner's General Circular No: 5 of 1872-73.

(2).

1653
2941

23
(9)

9-8-95

Governor's Office
10-3-94
Received

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
RECD. 2657(A)
DATE 13-3-94

To His Excellency the Governor
in Council
Mysore.

The humble petition of Krishtappah Son of Ramappa Goodiah residing in Ramapuram Kasaranachahin Hobly Bangalore Taluq. - - - -

Respectfully sheweth:-

That Petitioners deceased father Goodiah was the inventor, Chamboine of Nagthadumba till his death and after that the office devolved on his elder brother Ramappa.

That the latter held the office for upwards of 15 years but was imprisoned for an alleged saving a Police Officer in hushing up a theft case.

That thereupon the Petitioner Krishnappah, who is a married man and brother of the said Ramappa being qualified in every way to fill the office applied to be appointed Chamboine in his stead and after due enquiry and approval by the Amildar and Sub Division officer, Petitioner was recommended as

28

(13)

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
17487
07 JUN. 1895
Pet 736

L.R.87-93-10 1894.

Rec 6-95

be papers as

the

e.

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District

To

Rec:
The Secretary to the Govt.
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Dated 14th June/95.

Despatched 15-7th —Do—

Received

Enclosures—No. 1 file

General No.
D No. 1511.

the Senior Councillor
information now submitted
lled for by order of the Hon'ble
alkar Cantonment with ref=
Revision Petn. paper No (10),
ted by Petr Krishnappa —
e original order of which
ion is sought is recorded
paper No (5). It was passed
e 1st Councillor & the Hon'ble Mr
alKar

he questions for consideration
- whether Petr is a divided
undivided brother of the dis=
ssed Shanbhog Nanjappa,
undivided whether he may
mitted to discharge the duties
Nanjappa's life.

Post for by Hon'ble
estion of Govt
Decided.

Policies prepared
Clerk 3/7/95

Ref of case to be
to come before
Auditor 20/6

20/6
Issued 623 Jud
Produce & return
Clerk 1/7

The Chief Secretary's
No. 398 dated 28th June
Pet. 5-8
1894, regarding the Shanbhogi
of Muttsandra, Hoskote
Taluk. —

—

In reply, has the
honor to report that the
office has been registered
ed in the name of Krish=
nappa and that he and
Nanjappa, the dismissed
man are reported to be
divided in interest and
live separately from
each other. The evidence

(2) The Government order No: 927-34 -17- of 9th may 1881 - Rules that when a village Shanbogue is dismissed for an offence, it is not proper except in extreme cases that the family should be altogether debarred of their right to the office by the unqualified appointment of a stranger.

(3) The Petitioner having a divided brother living long since altogether separately in a separate village and being duly qualified for the work of a Shanbogue as has been certified to by a Managur of the village and as Petitioner has still his old mother living with him who is the Registerdar of the Shanbogue Office in question - the Petitioner most humbly prays that justice may be done by confering the vacancy on him. - - - -

Bangalore
10/3/94

Advocate for Petitioner

RECEIVED AT THE
27 MAR 94
OF MYSORE

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT'S OFFICE
INITIAL DEPARTMENT
2941 R
DATE 3-4-94

"By order"
Under Secretary.

27

To The Dy Commr
Bangalore

No. 398 / Pet: 58 dt 28-6-94 / 12/7/94

L. R. 87-93-9

With reference to his No 775 dated 10 January 1894 reporting on the petition of Ramiah regarding the Shanbags of Kuttandoor Hoskote Taluq, has the honour to request that he will be so good as to report in whose name the office has been registered under the latest order issued by him and whether Krishnappa Son of Shanbog Subbiah and Narsappa the dismissed Shanbog are members of a divided or undivided family.

By order

Head Clerk

L. J 3/7

29

94/95 D.R. No 3630

1 file

Memo No 915

Dy Commissioner's Memo No: 2035 dated 30-12-93 is received, perused.

Both Krishnappa and Ramaiah were summoned. Their depositions as well as those of the persons cited by them are enclosed for information.

Agam 86 28/5/95

Krishnappa says that he is divided from Thayappah and since from his sister 8 years. There was income-time Civil Court Decree against Gunnur Village Panchayat Case. Thereafter he died. It is to be mentioned that about 6 years ago sixteen took place but no document was executed to that effect. This was because Ramaiah his brother said that the execution of document would affect their County and decision pended for one marriage. Panchayatdars have effected the division amicably.

Thayappah, Poojari of Kallakere Lingayat Chowdry, Rajanna Krishnappa Chowdry, Dommanna and another Panchayatdar another-man of Krishnappa. Other persons examined are the Manager pensed from

How it will be known.

Ramiah appellant's witnesses say, Krishnapa is unmarried sister of Lakshmipati the disputed Executor. Krishnapa's statement that he is ready to give and that he is unwilling to know to such Srinivasa, Venkatapa, Somaiah and Lakshmipati. Besides these Magistrates Assn. Witnesses should be examined. Why is evasion of Krishnapa and is of a revised giving the decision having been effected wrongly.

Of these witnesses cited by Krishnapa, Lakshmipa did not appear and the others abscond. Lakshmipa and Chandrasekharaiah say that they have effected the decision of Gopinath & Krishnaiah and Lakshmipa but the document was executed to that effect as Ramaiah said that the executor of document should sign power and present the case marriage. The other witnesses of Ramaiah say that decision of property was effected but no one knows that any document was not executed.

The witnesses cited by Ramiah say that division never took place

31

Place between Krishnappah & Rangappa

that they are residents of the village and assured will be able to know me that you are the village and that some of them have signed the Marriage.

The witness on either side state in favour of him for whom they appear documentary evidence never produced on either side. The witness of Ramiah are residents of the village but those of Krishnappah are outsiders.

Krishnappa has an younger brother. The division appears to have taken place during their minority. This brought suit. The entire record is submitted.

Bangalore
25th May 95

Subordinate Judge's Court
Bangalore

Adv. Petition. No. 1570 / 95
Dated, Bangalore, 5th day of 95.

P

33

The alleged division is doubtful. It is admitted that the sisters are all living in one village and also in one house. The Deputy Commr. etc. directing the appointment of a man connected with the Petitioner's family as Manager during the Minority of the dismissed man, is right. This application is dismissed.

Draft. HCL
6/8
Asst. Secretary.

To

The Deputy Commr.
Bangalore District.

Witness.

2

324 (5) Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

Read:-

L.R. 87-93-11

Petition No 287 of 93-94, presented by Krishnappa of Kennur, Bangalore Taluk, praying for a review of the order of Govt conveyed in Endorsement No 663 dated 17th February 1894 rejecting his application for permission to discharge the duties of the Shanbhog of Kuntasandra, Bangalore Taluk in succession to his brother Nanjappa who was dismissed for having hushed up a case of theft.

(2) Docket No 151 dated 14 June 1895 from the Asst to Commissioner, Bangalore District stating in order to docket No 34 P.S. of 23.6.94 that the office has been registered in the name of Venkatappa, Krishnappa and that the evidence adduced to show that Petitioner and Ramakka are divided in interest and live separately is not conclusive.

1895-16

No. 1518

Name of Petitioner, Krishnappa Shanbogi Regi

Village, Mudsandra

Taluk, Hoskote

District, Bangalore

Date of Arzi, 22-10-95

Date of Receipt, 22-10-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, Nil

L.R. 87-93-13

ABSTRACT.

Praying that he may be appointed to look after the current duties of the Shanbogue of the above village of which right he has been wrested on the ground that he was the member of an undivided family.

This is a review petition & the petitioner's ground for review is that the Dy Comr of the Bangalore Distt has set aside the [illegible] of the

Amildar & Sub Dy officers 37 and the Mahazars of
inhabitants of the village to the effect that the P
the member of a divided family, in doubting the ve
of the above statement:
Urge that though the family house is one, there has been
division & that each is living in a separate portion of it

No.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1518

38

MYSORE DEWAN'S (illegible)
REGD. IN
DATE 22-10-95

ಸಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಲಿಸಾಲಿ ಸ್ಟೈ-ಸ್ಟೈಲಿಂಗ್‌ಗೆ ಹೈ ಕೊಡಲಾಯಿತು — ೪೫

ಅಂಗಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಲಿಗ್ರಾಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 436 ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ —

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗೇಶ್ವರ ಪ್ರಸಾದ ಮಹಾವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯ ಮತ್ತು ಸಂಶೋಧನಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರ

ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 40 22-10-95 ರಂದು

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗೇಶ್ವರ ಪ್ರಸಾದ ಮಹಾವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯ